


ATTACHMENT C
MOBILE SOURCE AIR TOXICS

Mobile Source Air Toxics

In addition to the criteria air pollutants for which there are National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), EPA also regulates air toxics. Most air toxics originate from human-made sources, including on-road mobile sources, non-road mobile sources (e.g., airplanes), area sources (e.g., dry cleaners) and stationary sources (e.g., factories or refineries).

Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs) are a subset of the 188 air toxics defined by the Clean Air Act. The MSATs are compounds emitted from highway vehicles and non-road equipment. Some toxic compounds are present in fuel and are emitted to the air when the fuel evaporates or passes through the engine unburned. Other toxics are emitted from the incomplete combustion of fuels or as secondary combustion products. Metal air toxics also result from engine wear or from impurities in oil or gasoline.

The EPA is the lead Federal Agency for administering the Clean Air Act and has certain responsibilities regarding the health effects of MSATs. The EPA issued a Final Rule on Controlling Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants from Mobile Sources 66 FR 17229 (March 29, 2001). This rule was issued under the authority in Section 202 of the Clean Air Act (CAA). In its rule, EPA examined the impacts of existing and newly promulgated mobile source control programs, including its reformulated gasoline (RFG) program, its national low emission vehicle (NLEV) standards, its Tier 2 motor vehicle emissions standards and gasoline sulfur control requirements, and its proposed heavy duty engine and vehicle standards and on-highway diesel fuel sulfur control requirements. Between 2000 and 2020, FHWA projects that even with a 64 percent increase in VMT, these programs will reduce on-highway emissions of benzene, formaldehyde, 1,3-butadiene, and acetaldehyde by 57 percent to 65 percent, and will reduce on-highway diesel PM emissions by 87 percent, as shown in the following graph:



As a result, EPA concluded that no further motor vehicle emissions standards or fuel standards were necessary to further control MSATs. The agency is preparing another rule under authority of CAA Section 202(l) that will address these issues and could make adjustments to the full 21 and the primary six MSATs.

Unavailable Information for Project Specific MSAT Impact Analysis

This EA includes a basic analysis of the likely MSAT emission impacts of this project. However, available technical tools do not enable the prediction of project-specific health impacts of the emission changes associated with the No-Build and Build Alternatives in this EA. Due to these limitations, the following discussion is included in accordance with CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1502.22(b)) regarding incomplete or unavailable information:

Information that is Unavailable or Incomplete. Evaluating the environmental and health impacts from MSATs on a proposed highway project would involve several key elements, including emissions modeling, dispersion modeling in order to estimate ambient concentrations resulting from the estimated emissions, exposure modeling in order to estimate human exposure to the estimated concentrations, and then final determination of health impacts based on the estimated exposure. Each of these steps is encumbered by technical shortcomings or uncertain science that prevents a more complete determination of the MSAT health impacts of this project.

1. Emissions: The EPA tools to estimate MSAT emissions from motor vehicles are not sensitive to key variables determining emissions of MSATs in the context of highway projects. While MOBILE 6.2 is used to predict emissions at a regional level, it has limited applicability at the project level. MOBILE 6.2 is a trip-based model--emission factors are projected based on a typical trip of 7.5 miles, and on average speeds for this typical trip. This means that MOBILE 6.2 does not have the ability to predict emission factors for a specific vehicle operating condition at a specific location at a specific time. Because of this limitation, MOBILE 6.2 can only approximate the operating speeds and levels of congestion likely to be present on the largest-scale projects, and cannot adequately capture emissions effects of smaller projects. For particulate matter, the model results are not sensitive to average trip speed, although the other MSAT emission rates do change with changes in trip speed. Also, the emissions rates used in MOBILE 6.2 for both particulate matter and MSATs are based on a limited number of tests of mostly older-technology vehicles. Lastly, in its discussions of PM under the conformity rule, EPA has identified problems with MOBILE6.2 as an obstacle to quantitative analysis.

These deficiencies compromise the capability of MOBILE 6.2 to estimate MSAT emissions. MOBILE6.2 is an adequate tool for projecting emissions trends, and performing relative analyses between alternatives for very large projects, but it is not sensitive enough to capture the effects of travel changes tied to smaller projects or to predict emissions near specific roadside locations.

2. Dispersion. The tools to predict how MSATs disperse are also limited. The EPA's current regulatory models, CALINE3 and CAL3QHC, were developed and validated more than a decade ago for the purpose of predicting episodic concentrations of carbon monoxide to determine compliance with the NAAQS. The performance of dispersion models is more accurate for predicting maximum

concentrations that can occur at some time at some location within a geographic area. This limitation makes it difficult to predict accurate exposure patterns at specific times at specific highway project locations across an urban area to assess potential health risk. The NCHRP is conducting research on best practices in applying models and other technical methods in the analysis of MSATs. This work also will focus on identifying appropriate methods of documenting and communicating MSAT impacts in the NEPA process and to the general public. Along with these general limitations of dispersion models, FHWA is also faced with a lack of monitoring data in most areas for use in establishing project-specific MSAT background concentrations.

3. Exposure Levels and Health Effects. Finally, even if emission levels and concentrations of MSATs could be accurately predicted, shortcomings in current techniques for exposure assessment and risk analysis preclude reaching meaningful conclusions about project-specific health impacts. Exposure assessments are difficult because it is difficult to accurately calculate annual concentrations of MSATs near roadways, and to determine the portion of a year that people are actually exposed to those concentrations at a specific location. These difficulties are magnified for 70-year cancer assessments, particularly because unsupportable assumptions would have to be made regarding changes in travel patterns and vehicle technology (which affects emissions rates) over a 70-year period. There are also considerable uncertainties associated with the existing estimates of toxicity of the various MSATs, because of factors such as low-dose extrapolation and translation of occupational exposure data to the general population. Because of these shortcomings, any calculated difference in health impacts between alternatives is likely to be much smaller than the uncertainties associated with calculating the impacts. Consequently, the results of such assessments would not be useful to decision makers, who would need to weigh this information against other project impacts that are better suited for quantitative analysis.

As discussed above, technical shortcomings of emissions and dispersion models and uncertain science with respect to health effects prevent meaningful or reliable estimates of MSAT emissions and effects of this project. However, even though reliable methods do not exist to accurately estimate the health impacts of MSATs at the project level, it is possible to qualitatively assess the levels of future MSAT emissions under the project. Although a qualitative analysis cannot identify and measure health impacts from MSATs, it can give a basis for identifying and comparing the potential differences among MSAT emissions—if any—between the No-Build and Build Alternatives. The qualitative assessment presented below is derived in part from a study conducted by the FHWA entitled *A Methodology for Evaluating Mobile Source Air Toxic Emissions Among Transportation Project Alternatives*, found at:

< www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/airtoxic/msatcompare/msatemissions.htm >

For the Build Alternative in this EA, the amount of MSATs emitted would be proportional to the vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, assuming that other variables such as fleet mix are the same for the No-Build and Build Alternatives. The VMT estimated for the Build Alternative is slightly higher than that for the No-Build Alternative, because the additional capacity increases the efficiency of the roadway and attracts rerouted trips from elsewhere in the transportation network (See Table 1). This increase in VMT would lead to higher MSAT emissions for the action alternative along the highway corridor, along

with a corresponding decrease in MSAT emissions along the parallel routes. The emissions increase is offset somewhat by lower MSAT emission rates due to increased speeds; according to EPA's MOBILE 6.2 emissions model, emissions of all of the priority MSATs except for diesel particulate matter decrease as speed increases. The extent to which these speed-related emissions decreases will offset VMT-related emissions increases cannot be reliably projected due to the inherent deficiencies of technical models.

Emissions will likely be lower than present levels in the design year because of EPA's national control programs that are projected to reduce MSAT emissions by 57 to 87 percent between 2000 and 2020. Local conditions may differ from these national projections in terms of fleet mix and turnover, VMT growth rates, and local control measures. However, the magnitude of the EPA-projected reductions is so great (even after accounting for VMT growth) that MSAT emissions in the study area are likely to be lower in the future in nearly all cases.

The additional travel lanes contemplated as part of the Build Alternative will have the effect of moving some traffic closer to nearby homes, schools and businesses; therefore, there may be localized areas where ambient concentrations of MSATs could be higher under the Build Alternative than the No-Build Alternative. The localized increases in MSAT concentrations would likely be most pronounced along the expanded roadway sections. However, as discussed above, the magnitude and the duration of these potential increases compared to the No-Build Alternative cannot be accurately quantified due to the inherent deficiencies of current models. In sum, when a highway is widened and, as a result, moves closer to receptors, the localized level of MSAT emissions for the Build Alternative could be higher relative to the No-Build Alternative, but this could be offset due to increases in speeds and reductions in congestion (which are associated with lower MSAT emissions). Also, MSATs will be lower in other locations when traffic shifts away from them. However, on a regional basis, EPA's vehicle and fuel regulations, coupled with fleet turnover, will over time cause substantial reductions that, in almost all cases, will cause region-wide MSAT levels to be significantly lower than today.

Construction activity may generate a temporary increase in MSAT emissions. Project-level assessments that render a decision to pursue construction emission mitigation will benefit from a number of technologies and operational practices that should help lower short-term MSATs. In addition, the SAFETEA-LU has emphasized a host of diesel retrofit technologies in the law's CMAQ provisions - technologies that are designed to lessen a number of MSATs.¹

Construction mitigation includes strategies that reduce engine activity or reduce emissions per unit of operating time. Operational agreements that reduce or redirect work or shift times to avoid community exposures can have positive benefits when sites are near vulnerable populations. For example, agreements that stress work activity outside normal hours of an adjacent school campus would be operations-oriented mitigation. Also on the construction emissions front, technological adjustments to equipment, such as off-road dump trucks and bulldozers, could be appropriate strategies. These technological fixes could include particulate matter traps, oxidation

¹ SAFETEA-LU, Public Law 109-59, August 10, 2005

catalysts, and other devices that provide an after-treatment of exhaust emissions. The use of clean fuels, such as ultra-low sulfur diesel, also can be a very cost-beneficial strategy.

The EPA has listed a number of approved diesel retrofit technologies; many of these can be deployed as emissions mitigation measures for equipment used in construction. This listing can be found at: < www.epa.gov/otaq/retrofit/retroverifiedlist.htm >.

Table A1. Travel Characteristics**Estimated Annual Average Daily Traffic (Vehicles Per Day)**

Year								
2006					2025			
Segment	Alternative	Araby Road/ SR 195	Arterials	Total	Alternative	Araby Road/ SR 195	Arterials	Total
Interstate 8 to Co. 11th Street	No Action	14,169	54,430	68,559	No Action	43,600	86,800	130,400
	Preferred	NA	NA	NA	Preferred	49,000	97,600	146,600
Co. 11th Street to Co. 12th Street	No Action	NA	NA	NA	No Action	29,700	18,900	48,600
	Preferred	NA	NA	NA	Preferred	32,400	NA	32,400
Co. 12th Street to Co. 13th Street	No Action	NA	NA	NA	No Action	22,300	5,000	27,300
	Preferred	NA	NA	NA	Preferred	32,400	NA	32,400
Co. 13th Street to Co. 14th Street	No Action	NA	11,165	11,165	No Action	20,000	47,600	67,600
	Preferred	NA	NA	NA	Preferred	32,400	38,400	70,800
South of Co. 14th Street	No Action	NA	NA	NA	No Action	NA	NA	NA
	Preferred	NA	NA	NA	Preferred	15,800	NA	15,800

Estimated Daily Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT Per Day)

Year								
2006					2025			
Segment	Alternative	Araby Road/ SR 195	Arterials	Total	Alternative	Araby Road/ SR 195	Arterials	Total
All	No Action	18,250	32,798	51,048	No Action	41,800	124,000	165,800
	Preferred	NA	NA	NA	Preferred	56,900	126,650	183,550

Note: NA = Not Applicable